

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, the Applicants have corrected the typographical error in claim 9. Claim 9 now depends from claim 8.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8 and 10 as anticipated by Whittington. The Examiner argues that Whittington shows a universal collar (Fig. 1) that attaches to a pump 20 comprising a first bracket flange and bracket 18 and a second flange and keyplate (member which 18 is connected to). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The structure referred to by the reference number 18 in Whittington is the pump. Whittington's pump does not have a collar attached to it having a first and second flange adapted to capture a keyplate therebetween. Indeed, the dispenser shown in Whittington does not have a keyplate. In Whittington, the pump is held against axial movement without the necessity of a key. The Applicants' invention, in contrast, is designed to bypass the keying system in existing dispensers. In these dispensers, an axially extending keyplate is provided within the dispenser having a keyway that receives a unique key that projects from a collar attached to the pump such that only one type of bottle may be used in connection with the dispenser. To bypass the keyplate, the Applicants provide a universal collar that attaches to the pump having a first flange and a second flange that are axially spaced from each other a distance sufficient to receive the keyplate therebetween. So situated, the flanges axially secure the container by acting as stops against any vertical movement of the container.

Whittington does not disclose a universal collar that is attached to the pump because it does not rely on a keying system to restrict axial movement of the container. Consequently, Whittington does not contemplate the use of a collar capable of bypassing a keying system and axially securing the container. If one of ordinary skill were to insert a container having Whittington's pump 18 in a dispenser having a keying system, nothing would restrict it from moving axially. Consequently, the Applicants believe that Whittington does not anticipate a universal collar as claimed in independent claims 1, 8 and 10 and respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection.

Application No.: 10/693,567
Response to Office Action dated 8/8/05
Due: 11/8/05

The Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 2-7 contain allowable subject matter.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants believe that claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request notice of the same.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing in more detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

Since one independent claim (claim 11) has been added in excess of the three independent claims permitted with the original filing fee, a check for \$200.00 is attached. In the event that any other fees required for the filing of this document are due, the undersigned attorney hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 18-0987.

Respectfully submitted,



Shannon V. McCue, Reg. No. 42,859
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
First National Tower - Fourth Floor
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242
Facsimile: (330) 376-9646

Attorney for Applicant(s)

October 13, 2005